

The Rufford Foundation

Final Report

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford Foundation.

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. The Final Report must be sent in **word format** and not PDF format or any other format. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work. Please be as honest as you can in answering the questions – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please complete the form in English and be as clear and concise as you can. Please note that the information may be edited for clarity. We will ask for further information if required. If you have any other materials produced by the project, particularly a few relevant photographs, please send these to us separately.

Please submit your final report to jane@rufford.org.

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

Grant Recipient Details	
Your name	Thinh Vu
Project title	Status and conservation of Green Peafowl (<i>Pavo muticus</i>) in Bu Gia Map National Park, Vietnam
RSG reference	10966-2
Reporting period	Final
Amount of grant	£6000
Your email address	vutienthinh@hotmail.com
Date of this report	10/6/2013

1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project’s original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
The project will be aimed at providing up-to-date information on the status and distribution of the species within the protected areas.			x	The project surveyed in two protected area including Bu Gia Map National and Easo nature reserve. The original objective is focusing in Bu Gia Map National Park and the reviewers advised to expand to other areas that has been inadequately surveyed in the past. So I chose Easo nature reserve. By the end of project, two protected areas have been surveyed.
Identifying a list of threats that green peafowl in the protected areas is facing.			x	
Raising the awareness for conservation among local communities and protected area staff			x	
Making contributions to establishing standard methods for green peafowl surveys and monitoring.		x		In this green peafowl, estimating calling probability is difficult

2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled (if relevant).

There were some unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project, as follows:

- Estimating the calling probability that can be used to estimate the correction factors is difficult than other species because the efforts cannot be the same across sites due to time constraints, weather, and unexpected events. Additionally, the number of green peafowl groups is not large enough for applying statistical methods. So, in the data analysis, I used raw number of groups detected.
- It is difficult to locate the exact location of the green peafowl groups because their songs sometimes were too short.
- Using published materials for choosing protected areas to survey is sometimes not reliable. The population of green peafowl groups in Bu Gia Map national park is not large as previously thought. By choosing the previously surveyed areas that has been mentioned a reliable publication and consulting experienced experts seems to be a good

strategy to follow. After the survey in Bu Gia Map National Park with little information, I choose Easo nature reserve and find significant populations there.

3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

The project provided up-to-date information on the status and distribution of the species within the protected areas and surrounding areas. This information will be valuable in directing conservation efforts for green peafowl in Vietnam. The three most important outcomes are:

- The population of green peafowl in Easo nature reserve is large enough and has conservational significance. A total of 10 groups were detected during the survey. The species mainly inhabit the dry forest and grassland in the eastern part of the reserve. In Dak Lak province, this may be the second largest population of green peafowl after Yok Don National Park. This should be a priority site for green peafowl conservation in Vietnam.
- The population of green peafowl in Bu Gia Map is quite small and does not have conservational significance. Interview information indicated that green peafowl is quite abundant in Quang Truc commune (Tuy Duc district, Dac Nong province) that borders Bu Gia Map National Park in the north.
- The awareness for conservation among local communities and protected area staff have been raised during the course of the project. Park staff have participated in the survey. The awareness for conservation of green peafowl among local community was raised through presentation in secondary schools and will be dispersed through the communities and make significant contribution to saving this endangered bird species.

4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefitted from the project (if relevant).

We presented the value of biodiversity and green peafowl to secondary pupils and local teacher and give them the t-shirts (see photos). T-shirt depicting the green peafowl and the message "Conservation of Green peafowl is the preservation of the beauty of the Highland". We think that the awareness for conservation of this species will be dispersed through the communities and make significant contribution to saving this endangered bird species.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

Yes, I would like to survey some other dry forests in Central Highland of Vietnam. Green peafowl in the areas in the northern part of Central Highland have not been paid much attention and little information about them is available for decision making.

6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

I will publish the result in a scientific journal and share with protected area staff. The results will also be shared with other conservationist in the conferences.

7. Timescale: Over what period was The Rufford Foundation grant used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

The projects started in March 2012 and end in October 2013, lasting for 18 months. The actual length of the project is 8 months. The species only emit the songs in late spring to early summer. Therefore, we carried out the fieldwork in 2 years and cannot finish the project as planned.

8. Budget: Please provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used.

Budget Details

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Equipments				
Binoculars: For field assistants to observe birds	248	250.7	3	
Digital camera: Record project details, photos of birds (1)	186	176.9	-9	
Amplifier, MP3 player for broadcasting alarm calls	150	150.4	0	
GPS (GPS Map60CSX) for obtaining location data in dense forest (1)	279	241.8	-37	
Individual Field Equipment: Field clothes and shoes (10); backpacks (5); compasses (2); notebooks; stationery; insect repellent and leech socks; rain jackets (15); snake gaiter (2); headlamps (5)	336.2	362.7	27	
Camping Equipment: hammocks (5) tents (2), sleeping bags (5), candles, cooking stoves, cooking utensils.	469.6	353.9	-116	
Rechargeable batteries and batteries for digital camera, GPS and other field equipment	161.2	69.3	-92	
Personal medication and first aid kit	91	103.2	12	
Telecommunication including internet, telephone	40	59.0	19	
Maps needed for sampling design and navigation	62	88.5	26	
Sub-total	2023	1856.4	-167	
Field expenses				
Training course for BGMNP staff and local people (15 people x 3days x £9.3/person/day)	418.5	59.0	-360	We did not need much time for training, training were mostly carried out in the field
Travel from Hanoi to study sites and Via versa	200	368.6	169	
Travel inside the reserve and during the interview period	150	353.9	204	Motorbikes were hired
Wage for field assistants	1162.5	1327.1	165	
Wage for porters to help move to the campsites and moving between campsites	248	235.9	-12	
Food and lodgings for field assistants	930	895.8	-34	
Food and lodging principal investigators	558	610.5	52	

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Designing and printing Shirts given to local people	310	294.9	-15	
Sub-total	3977	4145.6	169	
Total	6000	6002	2	

9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

More effort should be given for the survey in the northern part of the Central Highland of Vietnam to understand the current distribution of the species in the whole country and indentify green peafowl populations of conservational significance. Green peafowl hunting and trapping is still a concern, therefore, conservation education in the areas that is indentified as sites supporting large population of green peafowl should be strengthened.

10. Did you use The Rufford Foundation logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?

Yes, I put the logo of RSGF on the T-shirts and presentation.

11. Any other comments?

Providing full funding for attending RSG grantee workshop will increase the number of attendee sharing project results.